

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/818,940	GOLUBCHIK ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Zachary A. Davis	2137	

All Participants:

(1) Zachary A. Davis.

(2) David Brown (Applicant's representative).

Status of Application: Pending - Final Rejection

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 28 February 2006

Time: 4:45 pm

Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, and 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims discussed:

1, 6-9, 12, 13, 17-19, 21-30

Prior art documents discussed:

Boyle, US 6138158

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.


(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The Examiner indicated outstanding issues regarding indefiniteness under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, in Claims 1, 6-9, 12, 17-19, 21-23, and 30, and other formal issues in the Claims. The Examiner indicated that once the formal issues were resolved, independent Claims 1, 13, and 29 and their dependents appeared to be in condition for allowance, pending an updated search. The Examiner then briefly presented arguments in response to Applicant's remarks in reference to the rejection of Claims 23-28 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), regarding limitations allegedly not taught by the Boyle reference, which have been expanded upon in the attached Office action. Agreement was not reached regarding the art rejections, and Applicant's representative did not give permission for an Examiner's Amendment. The Examiner indicated that a written Office action would be mailed detailing the above formal issues and arguments for Applicant's further consideration..